F.O.R. Fellowship

• • May, 1951 • Vol. XVII—No. 5 • 20 cents a copy—$2.00 a ye

Jerusalem, Jerusalem

"And when Jesus drew nigh unto Jerusalem, he saw the city and wept over it."

Remembering the days when he was Joseph's son
when Jerusalem was a city to be dreamed of,
"The temple of the Lord," "our Father's house,"
"the dwelling place of God."

How long a boy
can feed on dreams and wear them in his heart,
yet how the shattered dream can break a heart
or bleed it slow to death.

Jerusalem
who broke the greatest heart that ever beat
and stopped her ears when every stone cried out
is called by other names, is Paris, France;
is London on the Thames, is Washington,
and murders prophets still.

Oh Nazarene,
our hearts must break with yours, who watch our world
reject its gifts of life—If we had known,
even we, this day, what things belong to peace!

—Peggy Pond Church

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

ff The world is fleeing in terror from a situation it has created itself, says Niel Glixon, as if it were a physical cataclysm over which men have no control. But, he argues, men should take heart, for "War Is on the Defensive." . . . Scientist Alexander D. Mebane analyzes "The Paranoia Race" now going on between the United States and Russia. . . . A missionary writes a "Letter from Red China." . . . Prof. Nels Ferre of the Vanderbilt University School of Religion contributes a deeply moving meditation, "Let the Redeemed Say So" . . . and Culbert G. Rutenber, in "The Totalitarian State and the Individual Conscience," gives one of his penetrating analyses of the relationship between man, his God, and the state.

Urgent!

Alfred Hassler and Bayard Rustin of the National Office are both urgently in need of good secretaries, their own having both married and moved away. Starting salary is about $50 a week, and it is possible to live on this in New York City, as all the staff has been doing so for years. (Incidentally, the figure reported in March was inaccurate.) Write, wire or phone the National Office at once!

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the

Fellowship of Reconciliation

21 Audubon Avenue
New York 32, N. Y.

A. J. MUSTE, *Secretary*

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, *International Secretary*

ALFRED HASSLER, *Editor*

CONSTANCE MUSTE, *Assistant Editor*

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Vera Brittain
Margueritte Harmon Bro
Allan Knight Chalmers
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Elisabeth D. Dodds
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Wallace Hamilton
Erna Harris
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Milton Mayer
Alfred D. Moore
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Lovejoy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly except August. Re-entered as second-class matter July 1, 1947, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879; additional entry at Lebanon, Pa.

20 Cents a Copy $2 a year

Fellowship
the journal of the fellowship of reconciliation

May, 1951 Vol. XVII—No. 5

PACIFISTS MUST NOT ACT
DEFEATED, THIS AUTHOR SAYS—

War Is on the Defensive

By NIEL GLIXON

THE giant telescopes of Mount Palomar compel us to deliver to mankind a message unlike any message in history. But it is a message so terrible that any attempt to measure it in words must prove ridiculous. For the message, fellow creatures, is this: history is at an end. I repeat: in 48 hours we shall all be dead. A comet whose path was last charted ten years ago was expected to pass the earth at a distance of two million miles. We have just charted its path again. Previous calculations, we are absolutely certain, were mistaken. The comet will pass within 250 miles of the earth and take about 48 hours to go by. During that time the earth will rotate its entire surface twice, like a fowl on a barbecue, opposite the white hot fires. The heat radiated by the comet will be so great that no animal life we are acquainted with can possibly live. There is absolutely no time in which we can prepare to withstand this event. In 24 hours the comet will have approached closely enough to begin parching the eastern coast of South America. The second day must dawn on a lifeless world."

Of course no such event as this has been announced. But we are acting as if it had. Such an announcement would concern an event over which men could exercise no control, and our only realistic course would be to prepare to abandon ourselves to it. But a war with Russia, an event comparable in magnitude, would be an event brought about by people. It is, therefore, an event that may be controlled, and hence may be avoided, by people.

This is not the attitude we take. The newspapers informed us recently that "the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, representing more than 31,000,000 members . . ., said yesterday that its call for the special prayer day [Sunday, December 31, 1950] has brought nationwide response." Which means simply that a significant number of American citizens

look upon the coming of war as an event comparable to the coming of a comet—with despair, *désespoir* (as the French say), "lack of hope."

And indeed it may be that that war will not be averted. And then, in the future time, historians among the huddled survivors may arise like prophets, and proclaim, with mantic air, that it had been an "irrepressible conflict." But if the catastrophe which we seem to see moving so inexorably toward us is not repressed, it may be because we, simply, did not really care to repress it.

Two Things Necessary

Such a concern to avoid a war with Russia would have to manifest itself in two ways: in a determination to see all the facts, about ourselves as well as others; and in a determination to care as much for neighbors as for ourselves. Nothing less is likely to do. Wilful self-deception and complacency will blow us to pieces.

Soviet propagandists tell us many big lies, but there is no Big Lie so big as the one we tell ourselves. This is the lie—no Goebbels or Vishinsky, strong competitor though he be, can beat it—that we are the Great Nation. Weekly we thank God that we are his chosen ones. Daily we thank history for having arrived, in the fullness of time, at us. Hourly we chastise others for not recognizing us as their saviors. But only men groggy with lies will believe this, and other men, non-Americans, do not. In Italy, a few years ago, a cartoonist depicted the mayor of a Mt. Etna village, addressing his fellow-townsmen while the volcano smoked threateningly in the distance. "Germans, Englishmen, and Americans," he exclaimed, "passed through this town; it's silly to fear a miserable lava eruption."

The generals of our "psychological warfare" discover, in fact, that there is one enemy weapon they are powerless to combat. It is the fact that virtually every piece of Communist propaganda gathers a husk of vicious distortion about a hard kernel of truth. Until we remove the biggest and ugliest of those truths, our word-throwers are virtually immobilized. Such truths are four in number: (1) we despise the colored races; (2) we become increasingly indifferent to the exercise of our own liberties; (3) we regard other nations as means through which we may secure our own ends; and (4) we casually accept war as an agent of human relations. On these I wish to elaborate.

But before the liberal reader protests that he does not need reminders of the self-evident, let me assert that it seems to me he does. Some years ago Dwight Macdonald described the pattern of thought in the polemics of Norman Thomas, probably the most intelligent liberal political in this country. On any one issue, wrote Macdonald, Thomas's articles usually cry, in succession: "We Must Move Quickly"; "There Is No Time Left"; "Just One More Chance"; and finally "—Bitched Again!" So I was not surprised, in picking up a copy of a liberal journal last November, to see that one of the leading articles was entitled "Our Only Remaining Hope" —of course by Norman Thomas.

A critic of liberalism perhaps will be permitted to ask how often one may fall off a precipice and still remain on the brink. The reformer tends to regard each evil in isolation from the others, and to

forget that a group of genuine evils may add up to a sick, possibly even a moribund, society. When the Communists shout that two plus two equals five, the liberals rejoin that, on the contrary, it only equals two.

And before the anti-Stalinist, Hook-line-and-Burnham reader curls his lip at one more preachment that we must become spotless before we dare oppose totalitarianism (for has not Koestler provided us with our motto: "We fight a total lie in the name of a half-truth"?), let me repeat that it is chiefly a small number of root evils that I suggest we destroy. Communism conquers many with Siberias and bullets, but it conquers more with propaganda. It may be that we are in the historic position described by Toynbee, where we must respond totally to a challenge or be destroyed. If the Communists make the faults of American democracy look four times as big as they are, we may have to reduce them to one-fourth times one-fourth as big as they are if we are to offer an example preferable to communists'. A large order; but we face a large situation.

When Sinclair Lewis (the idea for *Kingsblood Royal* no doubt germinating in his mind) reviewed, several years ago, a group of books about the Negro in America, he entitled his review "Gentlemen, This Is Revolution." The revolution never materialized, but the explosive potential remains. Human patience reaches an end, as a series of bloody race riots ought to have taught us. Of all our luxuries, racial prejudice is the most odious; in this respect, Northerners have no cause for pride, a fact to which the Negro ghettoes in every city, town, and village in the nation attest.

Chicago Sun-Times Syndicate By Lichty

"We have a few very desirable houses right smack in the center of town . . . a safe distance from any Government A-bomb practice area. . . ."

Europeans, Africans, and Asiatics observe these matters with great interest. They also note the Chinatowns, and the Oriental exclusion acts. Speaking of the unusual war-crime trial of General Yamashita, Dwight Macdonald wrote:

> It fits into a pattern. The Japanese-Americans were moved, en masse, to detention camps during the war, on strictly racial lines, regardless of individual behavior or patriotism; German-Americans were not so treated. Our troops killed most Japanese who tried to surrender, but treated German prisoners according to the laws of war. . . . The atomic bombs were dropped on Japanese cities. I

wonder if they would have been dropped on German cities. In short, there seems to be evidence that—partly from racial prejudice, partly because our culture is so alien to Japan's—we treated the Japanese in the late war with a contemptuous brutality we did not exercise against our white enemies.

Indiscriminate Prosecution

Our carelessness for the liberty of action of "others" reflects our indifference to our own. For fifteen years the American Communist Party has been completely in the service of the Comintern. In our sudden awakening to that fact we have prosecuted all political deviates with undiscriminating malice. Recently an acquaintance of mine who had been in prison during the last war as a conscientious objector, but who had subsequently received a Presidential pardon, was being considered for teaching positions by department chairmen in two leading American universities. In both cases he became the chairman's first choice to fill the vacancy; in both cases higher administrative echelons vetoed the choice. Why? "Because this man is *too different* to be suited to our university."

The dismissal of those who refused to sign the University of California oath, and the occasional persecution of Progressive Party members, are other recent demonstrations of the dangers encountered by those who attempt to exercise our vaunted freedom of speech. During the last war, to the "relocation" of Japanese-Americans was added the introduction of unpaid slave labor to the United States in the form of the Civilian Public Service camps for conscientious objectors, not to mention the imprisonment of hundreds of others.

Yet all such matters are picayune when compared to the really serious deprivations of freedom we tolerate. An expression of these would require the lengthy enunciation of a whole political philosophy. Though that cannot be undertaken here, perhaps it may be suggested by raising one or two questions: Is conscription compatible with our ideals of liberty? How much say have American workmen over the conditions of their labor, the quality of their products, the distribution of their products? Finally, how is it that no one ever inquires about *why* so many Americans never vote? Is it because they fear that the answer may point, not to apathy toward politics in general, but to apathy toward American politics in particular, with its Tweedledum-Tweedledee choices, and its administrative machinery remotely controlled, as if from an invisible mountain peak? Perhaps we should not wonder that people pray for political change as they would to Jove on Olympus.

After five years of rejecting the friendship of Franco Spain, we are once again exchanging ambassadors. This follows an earlier, minor concession to Spain by the UN which was magnified by Spanish newspapers into a tremendous victory for Franco, and accepted by anti-Franco forces as proof that any concerted attempt they might make to overthrow El Caudillo would receive no support whatever from any nation on earth. Last August the New York *Times*, under the headline "Anti-U.S. Feeling Is On Rise in India," reported that after the atomic bomb, nothing has injured our prestige in India so much as our support of Franco and the Bao Dai forces in Indo-China

And probably none of these actions has been so obviously ruinous as our support of Chiang in China.

All of these actions have been based upon our unwillingness to recognize the major political fact of the Twentieth Century. Ortega y Gassett calls it "the revolt of the masses." We will recognize it as the extension into Asia of the same forces which issued, in the Occident, in the great and various revolutions in America, France, Russia, and England, which have already made themselves felt in India. When Nehru visited the United States in 1949, it was natural that he should attempt to instruct us concerning this revolution.

> . . . You see in Asia today [he said in one speech] vast movements, quite apart from the natural desires for nationalism and political freedom. They are primarily great movements dealing with the land, because unless you solve the agrarian problems arising from feudal conditions, it is difficult to make progress in any other direction. . . . Certainly, when large numbers of people are on the move, as in Asia, to think that by force you can make them do this or that seems to me to ignore the reality of the problem. . . . Unless any political or economic scheme that is put forward satisfies that social conscience of the world, it is insufficient, regardless of how you may justify it. When vast masses of people are awake and realize their own pitiful condition and are not prepared to submit to it, it becomes exceedingly important that any steps we may take should satisfy that social conscience. . . . Unless it is done, those people are apt to look in other directions and seek other slogans.

Nathaniel Peffer is only one of many experts on China to point out that our support of Chiang has driven moderate Chinese into the arms of the Communists. If we help clamp down the lid, the steam is going to escape through some other opening. And our policy seems always to be: back the incumbents. Whatever motives—economic, political, or other—are responsible for this policy, they are making us the enemies of literally millions of people. This, too, is a fact that all the official Voices of America sounding from all the loudspeakers in the world can do nothing to change. We are not likely to persuade people we are their friends while we back their assassins.

Loose Talk

A new word, "peace-monger," was coined last year, which led one philologist to speculate on what the psychological effect of such a coinage might be. Applied, as it was at first, to Vishinskys and hypocritical peace-petitioners, it made some sense. Needless to say, by now we once more tend to call a fool anyone who proposes peaceful alternatives to war as a method of resolving international tensions. Last year, when President Truman was angered over a review of his daughter's concert, he threatened to break the critic's jaw and kick him in the groin. Among all the wry comments on the President's behavior, none ventured to suggest the obvious—that his behavior on a personal level corresponded to his and the country's behavior on a national level. James P. Warburg informs us that there was great alarm in Washington last summer at a rumor that the cold war might be brought to a peaceful end. Like most children, we are intent on getting our way, and turn, as if by habit, to violence, if no other method comes immediately to mind.

It is as if the two wars of this century—forgetting those of previous eras—had actually brought about a reduction of the tyranny, slavery, and murder in the world, as if they had not made the world of *1984* rather a likelihood than a mere possibility.

A Grim Future

Readers of Orwell's not-so-fantastic novel will recall that periodically the enemies of Oceania were exchanged, Eastasia alternating with Eurasia as the current object of hate. Two years, not 36 years, after Orwell wrote, Oceania —Britain and America—prepares to employ Germans, Italians, and Japanese, the enemy Axis of World War II, as partners-in-arms against Soviet Russia and China, our "great democratic allies" of World War II. The Germans and Japanese having renounced militarism, observers report, as a flop and a crime, partly under our tutelage, they are to be asked to embrace it once more, like obedient servants, again under our tutelage. Such a policy will not exactly endear us to Poles, or Russians, or Chinese.

Such a world-wide military alliance against Russia and China is certain to have a result identical with the Unconditional Surrender policy of Franklin Roosevelt during the last war. According to most intelligent observers, the announcement in Germany of that policy had the exactly predictable effect of uniting virtually all Germans behind Hitler in the desperate hope of averting complete disaster. Even if we were ignorant of the millions of political prisoners performing slave labor in the Soviet Union, we might suspect that total tyranny will inevitably have bred opposition, silent as well as vocal. We may or we may not learn the lesson of the effects of Unconditional Surrender; but we might bear in mind the equation: war is to the Soviet people as Unconditional Surrender to the Germans.

And as if the futility of relying upon war for solutions had not been sufficiently evident before, we have atom bombs and hydrogen bombs, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to render it obscenely obvious. One thinks of the titles of articles and books by the experts on atomic weapons, "I'm a Frightened Man," *No Hiding Place, One World or None,* and is, strangely, not at all reassured by other books bearing sinisterly comforting titles like *We Are Not Helpless Against Atomic Weapons.*

No, the pacifists should get over their inferiority complex, for it is war that is on the defensive. Our racial hatreds, our lukewarmness about domestic liberties, our wilful ignorance of other people's needs, and the effects which all these facts have upon other men, are only minor offshoots of a major moral error, the acceptance of war as a means to an end, and the concept of man which that implies. "During a conflict," writes the existentialist Simone de Beauvoir, "the enemy is perceived as pure exteriority; he is simply a resistance to be overcome, a piece of human equipment. His extermination is not desired for its own sake, but as necessary means to the final success." It seems very likely that so long as we regard men as things we will be reduced to things ourselves; not to be platitudinous, that is the price of moral hardening. And modern war threatens to reduce us to "things" quite literally as well as figuratively.

(*Continued on page* 32)

The Paranoia Race

A Scientist's View of the Strategy of World War III

By ALEXANDER D. MEBANE*

WHEN SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON, on February 8, 1950, restated the foreign policy of the United States, he complained that Soviet policy responds only to "an existing situation of fact." What is the existing situation of fact in the world today? And is American policy making as sane a response as Mr. Acheson credits to the Russians?

The existing situation of fact is that both the United States and the USSR are now in a position to destroy one another's cities. The United States is able to destroy a greater number of cities, but the USSR is able to destroy more essential cities and to profit more by their destruction.

The prospect is of increasing power on both sides with which to destroy the other. In such a process, to whom will the advantage accrue?

The advantage must accrue, and increasingly so, to the Soviet Union. The USSR is much better situated in many ways than the United States to bear the brunt of an atomic war. Its industry has been built with military considerations in mind. Deep inland and dispersed over an enormous area, Russia's industrial plants would be difficult to seek out and destroy. The loss of a complete city would mean far less to the military economy of Soviet Russia than to this country and would be for them no new experience.

Moreover, no amount of atomic bombardment can prevent the Soviet Union from achieving its strategic goal of conquering the continent of Europe. The maximum that the United States could do in such a situation would be to convert the European capitals and industrial districts into radioactive "scorched earth," a measure of brutality not likely to win allies for the Americans in Europe or elsewhere.

The atomic bomb, for all its frightful power, is therefore of scant military use to the United States. Americans can destroy, but cannot enforce their will. Russia's purpose, on the other hand, is admirably served by strategic atomic bombing. The United States is a bombardier's paradise.

The above discussion omits one factor: defense. But this is a minor factor because so few atomic bombs (two or three) are required to cripple the largest of cities. The offense can always accomplish this without much difficulty. This is the meaning of the statement that *there is no defense.*

There is one thing which the United States could do to better its military position, but this involves

---

* Alexander D. Mebane is an organic chemist and author of Whither Must I Fly?, a taxonomic study of current plans for a warless world order.

discipline and becoming more like the Soviet Union. Primarily, a bettering of the American position requires decentralization.[1] Adequate decentralization has been officially stated to be impossible and undesirable because it would cost some three hundred billion dollars and turn the United States into a garrison state. American cities must, therefore, await their fate with such fortitude as they can muster.

In sum: In the "existing situation of fact" it is indisputable that the major cities of the United States can continue to exist *only* so long as Soviet Russia does not think it necessary to do away with them. The armaments race leads to ever greater vulnerability.[2] *There is no prospect now in sight of any reversal of this trend.*

America's Psychotic Response

The response of the United States to this situation is not a sane one. American foreign policy has departed so far from reality that it can be adequately described only in psychiatric terms. The type of psychosis involved, "delusional insanity," is that which results from inability of the personality to accept an existing situation of fact.

The present policy of the United States, sharply restated by Acheson, is "Peace through Strength." So far as I am aware, no one has denied that the testament of history is that, even in the times when defense existed, this was the customary highroad to war. And now there is no defense. What, then, justifies our policy-makers in ignoring the historical evidence? Can it be that our defenseless condition—the only new element in the situation—is actually supposed to confer *greater validity* on the policy of intimidation? No one (as yet) has departed from sanity to quite that extent. What justifies the policy is the contention, asserted again and again, that we are faced with an enemy entirely different psychologically from those faced by nations in any previous time. The future of the world has been made to rest upon this assumption. Is it a sane one?

It is not a sane one. It consists of two postulates, one of which is an affirmation of the paranoid outlook, the other a schizoid rationalization.

Postulate of Communist Diabolism: The rulers of Soviet Russia are by nature utterly malevolent and burn to do the United States all the harm they possibly can.

Postulate of Communist Rationality: However, they are by nature utterly rational and uninfluenced by emotion. They adopt at all times, with cold and unerring judgment, the most profitable course.

What condemns American policy as demonstrably schizophrenic is that *these two postulates are incompatible.* The Russian rulers may well be confirmed paranoiacs, and they may possibly be human calculating machines; they cannot be both at the same time.

Why is it necessary for our policy-makers to claim that Stalin is simultaneously a madman and the sanest man in the world? Was it in order to rationalize a policy that was adopted without use of the brain? The policy of "Peace through Strength" requires no

---

1 "Aside from general dispersal, little or no defense against the atomic bomb seems in prospect," Chester Barnard, *Scientific American,* Nov. 1949. See also R. E. Lapp's definitive discussion of the subject, ibid., June 1950.

2 "The hydrogen bomb will give us military weakness rather than strength," Hans Bethe, op. cit.

thought—to build up defenses is an automatic reaction to a disturbing situation. It was our immediate reaction, in 1945, to the shock of Russian intransigence.

The effect upon ordinary men of offensive armament aimed against them is to arouse fear and hatred. A paranoid tendency to believe that the armaments are being built for the purpose of attack, rather than for the ostensible purpose of deterring attack, is inescapable. Consequently "defensive" (retaliatory) armaments are built up on both sides. The vicious spiral of the classical armaments race has set in. It has a classical ending: Eventually one party thinks he sees an opening, and in spite of the known heavy cost to himself, he attacks. Why? Because his rationality was eventually submerged in the rising paranoia of the deadly competition. Our policy-makers were obliged, therefore, to postulate that the customary failure of prudence *could not happen* to the Russian rulers. This postulate was accordingly adopted. It was adopted *because it was necessary in order to prove a desired conclusion,* namely, the ability of armaments to contribute to the safety of the United States. This reversal of the logical process, "rationalization," is characteristically non-sane.

The "Schizoid Postulate" has been restated by Acheson in his crucial foreign-policy address. "What we have also observed over the last few years is that the Soviet government is highly realistic, and we have seen time after time that it can adjust itself to facts when facts exist." He gives as examples the fact that military aid to Greece and Turkey, and the Berlin airlift, did not result in all-out war. The inference drawn is that "vigorous" treatment of Soviet Russia will never result in all-out war. But surely so bold a psychological postulate is scarcely proved simply by demonstrating that war has not as yet resulted![3] This is similar to arguing that a man who has survived chicken pox, measles and whooping cough must be immune to all diseases!

Paranoid Tendencies in American Policy

The temptation in high places to the schizoid withdrawal is primarily inspired, no doubt, by the unendurable frightfulness and the unprecedented inevitability of our fate in an atomic war. Paranoid tendencies, however, are nothing new: they are to be expected in any nation engaging in an armaments race, and indeed in any individual made to feel that he is threatened by others. In all such circumstances a Postulate of the Enemy's Diabolism forcefully commends itself to the emotions. "The enemy," observing the resulting growth of bitter feeling against him, naturally concludes that there are grounds for adopting a similar postulate of his own; his ensuing actions serve to confirm the first party in his original suspicions of the diabolic nature of his enemy, and a vicious spiral is under way. This degenerative process, which may be called a *paranoia race,* is a natural accompaniment of armaments races and is the reason that unless interrupted, they invariably explode in war. Armament races may begin with one party more paranoid than the other, but they

---

[3] It should also be borne in mind that at the time of these "victories," Russia was not yet able to destroy our cities. This is no longer true.

tend to reach a state of high paranoia on both sides that is beautifully symmetrical. This state is unstable, and spontaneously explodes.

But although the Paranoid Postulate implies the inevitability of atomic war, it supplies its own solution to this difficulty; for paranoia, whose keynote is *self-justification,* furnishes an outlook on life that is complete and self-sufficient. In the paranoid ethical system, the duty of fighting the enemy is an absolute one: to weigh the consequences would be dishonorable and cowardly. For the enemy, being implacable, will conquer the world unless we conquer him. And, since he is diabolical in nature, conquest of the world by the enemy is the very worst thing that could possibly happen to the human race. Therefore, if fighting the enemy means atomic war; if it means the destruction of most of the cities of the world; if it means the transformation of thousands of square miles into radioactive deserts; if it means man-made plagues; if it means the extinction of democratic government everywhere; if it means permanent radioactive pollution of the very oceans and of the air itself, *if it means the death of all living things*[4]*—all of these are lesser evils.* In the paranoid ethics, what Russia might do to us if we failed to threaten her militarily must be considered to be *worse than the annihilation of the whole world.*[5] This is the fundamental article of the paranoid faith—and it is a faith. It is a fanaticism.

It was left for our generation to discover that sanity is not, after all, our birthright: it must be consciously preserved and defended against a *natural* susceptibility to paranoia. The frightful and spectacular career of Hitler's grossly paranoiac regime (which at first aroused only incredulous laughter) should have taught us all the lesson that fanaticism still works well-nigh irresistibly on the mind of man. Now we see another apparently paranoid empire—Stalin's. Our reply to the challenge has been to accept the invitation to an armament race—a paranoia race.

What reason is there to assume that the race will *not* run its course? Concretely—what reason is there to believe that the United States would shrink from killing every living thing on earth? There is nothing inherent in our present policy, nothing inherent in the character of our citizens, to justify any such superficial assumption. I say this with assurance, because the theoretical justification, on the basis of the paranoid ethics, of universal annihilation has already been given, and it has aroused no widespread revulsion.[5] Leo Szilard,

---

[4] It is possible and even not too unlikely that it actually *will* mean this. Leo Szilard (*Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* April, 1950), has pointed out that world extermination can readily be accomplished with only a few large hydrogen bombs, simply by surrounding them with a substance (cobalt, for example) that absorbs neutrons to become a long-lived emitter of high-energy gamma rays. Enough radioactive dust would be spread over the world to extinguish all life everywhere. Moreover, by this method it is "easier to kill all people in the world than just a part of them."

The use of neutron-absorbing substances to create pestilential radioactivity is not a technique that must wait on the advent of the hydrogen bomb: the production of virulent radioactive clouds in this way from plutonium bombs is already a part of our—and Soviet Russia's—armory. This is an especially effective way of rendering a whole city useless from the effects of a single atomic bomb.

[5] See Elmer Davis's lead article, "No World, If Necessary!" in the *Saturday Review of Literature,* March 30, 1946. This is not an isolated example: other

among others, has reminded us how far we have recently advanced along the road that leads to the ultimate act of paranoid violence. He recalled:

> In 1939 American public opinion was undivided on the issue that it is morally wrong and reprehensible to bomb cities and to kill women and children. During the war, almost imperceptibly, we started to use jellied gasoline bombs against Japan,[6] killing millions of women and children; finally we used the A-bomb. I believe that there is a general uneasiness among the scientists. It is easy for them to agree that we cannot trust Russia, but they also ask themselves: To what extent can we trust ourselves?[7]

The explicit antinomianism of the fiercely paranoid totalitarian states, Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia, has been abundantly expressed in the liquidation of Jews and kulaks, to mention no other instances. And the antinomianism of the United States has been expressed in jellied gasoline, white phosphorus, and Hiroshima. Perhaps we are not yet in the class of such first-rate antinomians as Genghis Khan and the Politburo, but the promised hydrogen bomb may be expected to change all that.

Now, the reader may have observed that ever since we entered upon the subject of paranoid tendencies, the tone of this discourse has tended to lapse into the emotional. There is a reason for this. In ethical questions there is no possibility of settling the issue by a scientific appeal to facts. The choice of ethical postulates is a *free* one. There is nothing I can urge against the antinomian ethics except to point out that it logically leads to the extinction ("if necessary") of all life on the earth and that the actual implementation of this logical conclusion is about to become feasible. If one chooses to go along with Elmer Davis, General Eisenhower and Secretary Acheson in considering the prospect of general annihilation less disturbing than the prospect of what Russia might do if she were not militarily threatened, he has the right to do so. The Golden Rule, a principle alien to man's primitive nature, cannot be forced on anyone.

The Road to Sanity

At this point the reader is entitled to lodge a serious objection. "You have admitted," he will remind me, "that there is substantial evidence to support the Postulate of Communist Diabolism, because the Stalinist regime is paranoid in character; how then can you fail to draw the customary conclusion that it is necessary for the free world to keep Russia under restraint? Talk of the Golden Rule

---

logical thinkers have seen and stated the full consequences of the Postulate of Communist Diabolism. In *The Struggle for the World* (p. 129) James Burnham remarks that "I think there are some to whom it will appear better that mankind should altogether perish than that communism should thus conquer." Burnham is an influential writer, whose present thinking runs parallel to the State Department's and only a little ahead of it.

On March 23, 1950, General Dwight Eisenhower, in the course of a lecture "dedicated to the cause of international peace," said: "Far better risk a war of possible annihilation than grasp a peace which would be the certain extinction of free men's ideas and ideals." The word "certain" betrays the derivation from the Postulate of Communist Diabolism.

6 We might also remember the companion military technique, the "anti-personnel" use of white phosphorus. Certainly those who actually witnessed the effects of burning phosphorus on human bodies will never be able to forget them.

7 *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, April, 1950, p. 109.

is not appropriate to the situation in which we find ourselves."

If I fail to draw the customary conclusion, I do so precisely because I am convinced that the Stalinist regime *is* paranoid in character. I feel quite safe in saying that no one can spend fifteen minutes reading present-day Russian writing from any source whatever without experiencing a sensation of panic at the pit of his stomach, and the conviction that he is in the living presence of madness.

What does psychiatry have to say on the treatment of paranoia?

Attempt to Contain

There is complete agreement that if a paranoiac seems to be a dangerous case—and the USSR is indubitably a dangerous case—there is nothing to do but confine him for the protection of society. The reader will now exclaim, "This is precisely what the United States *is* doing." But it isn't: it is *trying* to do it, and as it happens this is a very different matter. For we have nothing to work with, in our attempt at confinement (containment) but fear of retaliation, which is *not* effective on the insane, but only on the thoroughly calm and well-balanced mind. If Russia is mad, and we essay to confine her without having the actual power to do so, then war *must* come; it is not a matter of opinion.

If Americans behave exactly as Marx, Lenin and Stalin have predicted all along that the capitalist world will behave—if we confirm in detail the current propagandistic horror-tales about "imperialist warmongers"—who will win the support of the majority of Russians? Will it not be the all-wise little father in the Kremlin, who so truly warned his people of the base designs of the imperialist beasts? And can we ever conquer Russians in such a frame of mind? If we could, we should undoubtedly go right ahead and do it; but I do not believe the thing can be done.

The conclusion I reach, for which I claim no infallibility, is that the forcible confinement of the USSR *is impossible.* We have no choice but to propose *voluntary* "confinement."

Now, here are bald statements. How do we clothe them in concrete meaning? Remember that the reason for committing paranoiacs to an asylum is to protect society against their violence. In this sense, a nation is for practical purposes "committed to an asylum" when it is no longer able to wage war: i.e., when *disarmament* is enforced within that country. We must therefore propose to the Soviet Union *that all nations permit themselves to be disarmed under international police inspection.* The teeth of national paranoia would thus be drawn. Such an "international insane asylum" has a more familiar name: minimal *world government.*

This, then, is the necessary and sufficient proposal that must be made by the United States.

But we cannot stop here, for the likelihood that the proposal will find immediate aceptance is small indeed. To be sure, the Soviet Union has itself called for world disarmament (most recently at the 1948 UN Assembly in Paris), but unless the diagnosis of paranoia is entirely at fault, we may expect excuses to be found when the bluff is called. Where will this leave us? It will leave us practically nowhere. To have proposed the correct and sane solution will unify our own country (insofar as it is itself

sane) and arouse respect in Europe; but it will not help us in Russia, where it will be told that we have proposed Anglo-American world empire. We will still have the problem of treating a dangerous paranoid case, as we do at this moment.

According to the psychiatrists, this problem is not a hopeless one. Although full-fledged paranoia can scarcely be cured, it appears that this is not necessarily true of incompletely developed paranoid conditions.

"The reactions of the mentally ill must be taken at face value and responded to honestly. . . . Threatening or lying is intolerable."[8]

"It is exceedingly important that the physician avoid a critical attitude and gain the confidence of the patient. . . . Great care should be exercised both by the family of the patient and by the hospital personnel that their attitude toward the patient be not such as may stimulate aggressive or revengeful feelings."[9]

"A critical attitude must be rigorously avoided."[10]

From this we see clearly enough what our program will have to be. It is, as is to be expected, a program that goes dead against the grain of our own paranoid tendencies, but in order to encourage sanity in others it is necessary to strive for sanity in ourselves. It is not, however, a program entirely devoid of official support: Senator Tydings has proposed the essential structural feature, and Senator Brien McMahon has proposed a constructive strategy of persuasion.

But both of these men limited themselves to proposing *proposals*. This is not enough. We can propose arms control to Russia and propagandize our proposals until we are blue in the face, but if in practice we continue the armament race, it is nothing but words, words, words. "Threatening is intolerable"; there is nothing ambiguous in this statement.

Disarm Unilaterally

Barring a near-miracle, all proposals will get exactly nowhere unless and until we ourselves initiate *unilaterally* the disarmament we have proposed. "The first problem is to do away with mutual fear and distrust. Solemn renunciation of violence—not only with respect to means of mass destruction—is undoubtedly necessary." So said Albert Einstein.

So after all these words, the fundamental issue turns out to be very simple. Whatever words we utter, the fact is that we will either continue the arms race or abandon it, and that no reasonable hope of peace appears if we continue it. In other terms, we will either continue in the time-honored way to meet paranoia with counter-paranoia, with results that are predictable, or we will revolutionize human affairs by having *the courage to risk sanity*. The results of this are not predictable, since it appears that it has never been tried. But if the world is to endure at all in the presence of continuously increasing powers of destruction, someone, eventually, will have to refuse the call of paranoia. Why should it not be the United States? Is sanity,

---

8 Biddle, *Introduction to Psychiatry*, p. 202.

9 A. P. Noyes, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry* (N. Y., 1948) p. 408.

10 *Oxford Medicine*, Vol. VIII, p. 58, Henderson and Gillespie, op. cit., p. 379.

as it now seems to be, really beyond our powers?

Not Appeasement

We must dispose of the specter of the umbrella. Unilateral disarmament is *not* appeasement. Appeasement of paranoiacs—grudging and piecemeal relinquishment—is useless, as we saw with Hitler. There is nothing piecemeal about this, it should not be done in a grudging spirit, it relinquishes nothing that is of any value to us (unless we are interested in destroying Soviet cities simply for the sake of destruction). The paranoiacs in the Kremlin may, indeed, take the American abdication of the arms race as a sign of "weakness." Possibly they would so prevail upon their colleagues as to respond by the military occupation of Europe.[11] This is a chance that will have to be taken. It is a chance that we are taking all the time, since Europe cannot defend itself against the Red Army. So far as Europe is concerned, the only difference would be that in the event of Russian invasion it would suffer only Russian invasion; not Russian invasion *and* American atom-bombing, as in the present military arrangement. Many people seem to see the possibility of Russian invasion of Europe as a more immediate and frightening danger than the near-certainty of obliterative atomic war. I suggest that this is a paranoid value-judgment, and is not shared by the majority of the people of Europe.

Concretely, the policy of sanity calls for the following steps, none of them at all easy to put into practice:

(1) The proposal of world federal government having at least the power of enforcing[12] total disarmament.

(2) On Russian refusal, actual erection of such a government by all willing nations. Membership left open at all times to the USSR.

(3) Total disarmament by the "partial world federation" under inspection by all nations, including Russia. This includes physical destruction—for example, by sinking in the ocean—of practically all of the American stockpile of fissile materials; dismantling of Oak Ridge, Hanford, and Los Alamos; demobilization of armed forces and abolition of the Department of "Defense"; destruction of all secret military research and its records, except such as can be made public. The process can and should be carried out without revealing to Russia any military secrets, since she can have no sane reason for knowing these.

(4) Contribution of ten billion dollars a year (one-fourth of the money saved on armaments) in a world-federal cooperative "Point-Four" program of social and economic aid to all countries—*including* the Russian empire. (It is no use dangling this aid as a reward for submission, as proposed by Mc-

[11] Invasion of America itself is, of course, a sheer military impossibility. We could be atom-bombed, to be sure, but the reader who chooses to envision this as the Russian reaction should recall that we can be atom-bombed *no matter what we do*, and ask himself seriously whether American hydrogen bombs or American unilateral disarmament offer a stronger motive to the Kremlin to take this drastic step.

[12] Enforcement is the responsibility of an international police force armed with small arms. It is therefore not feasible unless the disarmament is total. For further details and problems concerning the organization of world federation see federalist books, e.g. Vernon Nash's comprehensive discussion in *The World Must Be Governed*, (N. Y., 1949).

Mahon. That is bad psychology, because of the unfavorable connotations of the word "bribe.")

If this program still fails to change Soviet behavior, there was no hope in any case.

Let us sum up the situation. The United States is confronted by a powerful empire of dangerously paranoid character, whom we cannot coerce, and against whose violence we are powerless to defend ourselves. There is no prospect that these conditions will change. Our choice is this: Should we respond, as nations have always done and as we are doing now, by counter-paranoia, "an attitude such as may stimulate aggressive or revengeful feelings"? Or should we "run completely counter to the traditions of our leaders" by summoning up the unheard-of courage to lead the way to sanity? The phrase just quoted was Senator McMahon's in dismissing unilateral disarmament in his February 2, 1950, speech. He could not have been considering Christ as one of "our leaders."

Reprinted by permission from the Summer, 1950, issue of American Perspective.

Letter from Red China

A missionary, teaching in one of China's Christian universities, gives his impressions of the state of affairs there last fall.

THE even tenor of studies has been roughly broken during the past two weeks. The advance of American troops across the 38th parallel and towards the Manchurian border has convinced government and people that China itself was threatened by an American capitalist government which has consistently supported a discredited Chiang Kai-shek, guarded Formosa from liberation, prevented the People's Government from representation at the United Nations, strafed Chinese border villages, stopped Chinese vessels in Chinese waters, and bolstered up corrupt regimes in neighboring Indo-China and Korea. There has been a tremendous upsurge of patriotic feeling. This was perhaps partly stimulated at first by the government, but it was in the main genuine indignation in response to the facts of the situation. Students, of course, have been more inflamed than anyone else, and during the past two or three days manifestos of loyalty to government directives whatever may be required, and volunteering for service with the Korean army, have been the order of the day. We do not know how this immediate question will be solved, but the resentment against America will not die down quickly, and in fact is likely to grow as long as America supports Chiang and guards Formosa.

* * *

The Yenching Christian Fellowship is showing considerable vitality. A Chinese friend recently returned from America after more

than ten years' absence from Yenching has remarked enthusiastically on the improvement in the quality of the Fellowship and the School of Religion compared with what he knew before. I think many of us would agree. Nowadays, although we miss the large contingent of westerners who used to attend services, Sunday chapel is full, and each morning daily chapel at 7:35 sees sixty to seventy people present, most of whom have come on from a morning watch held with their small group. Nine Fellowship small groups are thriving, including one newly formed. Each has about twenty members and meets weekly for study, discussion, worship or games. The Fellowship owes a great deal to people like last year's chairman, once my student in mathematics, who was imprisoned in 1942 and tortured by Japanese soldiers, later for two years a country worker along with Communist guerillas, and finally a student of the School of Religion, from which he graduated last June. His progressive enthusiasm and steady Christian conviction and loyalty held many Christians firm during the troubled days immediately after our "liberation," when to be a Christian was to be under censure as backward and superstitious. (Now this government is trying to keep strictly to its policy of freedom of religious belief, so that even a fundamentalist student of our neighboring university who attacked the government and said that an American invasion would be the punishment for its sins, was criticized on the grounds of his political naiveté and not his Christian belief.)

* * *

We wish there were space in this letter to give facts to justify our sincere admiration of the People's Government. Putting things briefly, it has won popular support during the past year such as no previous government has had, for such achievements as:

stabilizing living costs after headlong inflation;

preventing famine deaths (after bad harvests) by speedy grain distribution;

improved river control;

re-establishment of industries on a clear all-over plan;

successful redistribution of land in North China (a fundamental measure) and temporary rent reductions in South China (where land is to be redistributed later);

progressive elimination of banditry proceeding from North China southwards;

honest and very hard-working administration;

low pay and simple living for all civil servants;

successful mobilization of people of all parties for national reconstruction.

Reports of these successes which come to you are probably regarded as propaganda, but responsible observers here are coming to have a good deal of confidence in the factual reports made by administrators to the People's Consultative Council, and Yenching professors who have travelled around during the summer have brought back favorable reports of conditions they have seen.

Light and Shadow

See over earth darkness falling,
Hear a soft, insistent calling,
"Light a candle!"

—Franklin Zahn

The Totalitarian STATE AND The Individual CONSCIENCE

By CULBERT G. RUTENBER

THE TOTALITARIAN STATE is a new factor in human history. Only the 20th Century could have spawned it, because only the 20th Century had the means to produce it. Our modern streamlined tyrannies had to await the rise of modern science before they could be born.

It is science that has made possible a dictatorship so all-embracing as to make all previous dictatorships amateurish. For the first time in history, life can be effectively organized from a controlling center. Through the radio the voice of the dictator can be heard everywhere at once. Speedy transportation systems make possible the rapid doing of his commands. And a monopoly of the weapons of terror silences all protests as the logic of the machine gun supplants the logic of argument.

Corrupting Minds

Nor is this all. Even the printing press is turned against the people. The minds of the people are incessantly bombarded with propaganda. The young are corrupted. Through an absolute control of school and press the youth are taught to think one thought and believe one belief, to feel one emotion and to will one will. The totalitarian state is the crowning irony of a scientific age that was conceived in pride and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created self-sufficient. It has remained for the 20th Century to adopt as its insignia a boot stamping on a human face—forever.

Emil Brunner says that the totalitarian state is the most urgent problem of our civilization. And so it is. But we must be clear as to why this is so. It is not merely because the totalitarian state challenges the political and military structures of the West. To see the threat at that level is to miss the point. Nor is the menace of totalitarianism found in its challenge to the capitalistic system of free enterprise. To see the threat at this level is also to miss the point. The deadly peril which the Christian Church detects in totalitarianism is neither economic, nor political and military. It is moral. It is the judgment of the omnicompetent state that it robs a man of his God-given humanity and debases him into a mere repeater of slogans, a parrot of the party line with no will or manhood of his own. The totalitarian state is a plunderer of the mind, a saboteur of the soul.

The struggle between the Christian faith and the totalitarian state is a struggle for the soul and conscience of man. The totalitarian state must arrogate to itself the role of God in the modern world or it cannot survive. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," commands the police state, and it has the power to be a jealous god, visiting the iniquities of the father upon the children unto the third and fourth generation.

Are the attributes of deity omnip-

otence, omniscience, and omnipresence? These are the attributes of the deified state. It claims an absolute power over its subjects; it is the infallible guide of conduct; and its eyes and ears are everywhere. Like the true God, the new god effects a rebirth in the hearts of its worshippers, reconditioning the reflexes of the masses until they want no more. Moreover, it is the giver of every good and perfect gift. The state giveth and the state taketh away, blessed be the name of the state.

Conscience the Enemy

A human institution that makes pretensions of deity can brook no opposition. That is why the real enemy that must be liquidated is the individual conscience. A conscience that dares to say No to the state because it has said Yes to God is intolerable. In the very nature of the case, the totalitarian state must itself be the definer of justice, the creator of right and wrong.

Hence totalitarianism is a systematic effort to exterminate the human conscience. A man's soul must be eviscerated; his humanity stamped out of him. The image of God in man must be erased and for it must be substituted the faceless image of the mass man. Like a trained animal the creature must be made to respond in determinate ways to certain stimuli. He must be taught when to cheer and when to boo, when to shout and when to keep silent. He must have no will of his own, only a sense of identity and participation.

The terrifying truth about totalitarian man, the truth without which we cannot understand him, is that he has no conscience. His personal integrity has been eaten away. The totalitarian man can flipflop with the changes of the party line, embrace evil as good call falsehood truth—and without batting an eye. The soul has fled leaving only a depraved organism.

Against the terrifying power of suppression and torture which the police state commands, the individual conscience seems pathetically weak. But let us not sell it short. For God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things to confound the things that are mighty.

To the totalitarian claims of the state the Christian opposes the totalitarian claims of Christ—absolute and all-embracing, gathering into one surrendered focus every area and energy of life. The kingdoms of this world will yet become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever. The power of the beast that wars against the saints and puts his mark of slavery and degradation upon the foreheads of men is a limited and finite power that will come to an end. The lamb that was slain shall yet be enthroned. He shall take his great power and reign over the hearts of men as the king of love and truth.

But we are living in the day of battle and not the day of triumph; and to us who bear the heat of the day comes the call to strengthen those things that remain. This will not be easy. The substance of the Church has been wasted in wordly living, and the weapons of its warfare are rusty with neglect. But there is yet hope if the Church everywhere will address itself to the defense of the individual conscience against those forces that seek to destroy it. We must rebuild the moral foundation of modern life, without which civilization

cannot survive. Such an effort will take us into at least three areas: the political, the moral and the spiritual.

On the political front, we must guard at all cost our political freedom. Surely one thing that recent history has demonstrated clearly is the primacy of the political. Political man has supplanted economic man. Where the government can define right and wrong in economic matters, the advantage rests with the power of the political. It should now be clear everywhere that political liberty is the source and guarantor, under God, of all of our other liberties.

I do not think that democracy is the only kind of government in which Christianity can live. After all, the Church was born in a dictatorship. But for the last four hundred years the power of the state has been steadily growing. And today the power of the state has become so great that wherever political freedom is imperilled, the freedom of the Church and freedom of conscience itself is threatened.

It is one of the terrifying facts of the police state that it can effectually block every avenue of moral protest. This is a new fact in history. As Bertrand Russell has pointed out, in the totalitarian state the moral reformer could not acquire any influence even by martyrdom. His doctrine would never become known, for every channel for its proclamation would be denied him and he himself would be liquidated. In such a state, Christianity could never have been born, for it would have had no means of coming to birth. This is the measure of the importance of the political in our time. Therefore let no Christian say any more, "I'm interested in spiritual things; I'm not interested in politics." No Christian can today evade his political responsibility. To do so is to deny his Lord. Political freedom is the foundation for all other freedoms, including the freedom of conscience.

Knowing this, the Christian in society will be sensitive to trends which might presage future trouble. He will guard jealously existing civil rights. He will resist efforts to establish guilt by association. He will protest all efforts, however subtle, to make people think alike and believe alike.

Life Not Divisible

Nor will he ever admit that the state has the power to define moral right and wrong. If he takes up arms to fight in wars, he will not justify his position by saying, "The state commanded it," for he will know that no state can be the god of his conscience. He will seriously question whether war is not the breeder of the totalitarian spirit rather than its nemesis. At all events, he will refuse to divide life into two parts, allocating one part to God and another to Caesar as though these were equals. He will know that the claims of God are totalitarian and absolute and that every right of Caesar is limited and defined by the righteous will of God. The divine origin of the state is also its divine limitation. By such precautions Christians will see the totalitarian man arising afar off, and will run to meet him and undo him before he gathers strength.

But political freedom is not an end in itself; it is only an opportunity. Political freedom merely secures the flanks of the Christian movement, while the Church itself grapples with the problems of

justice and order. Justice and order are as important to society as is freedom. All three are necessary, synthesized in proper proportions. But if we are to be concerned with these, we must rebuild the sense of moral responsibility in the hearts of our citizens. And this leads us to the second area which the Church must strengthen—the area of personal moral responsibility.

No Responsibility?

Our modern world has a wonderful solution for the problem of individual responsibility: it denies its existence. No one is ever at fault; the blame lies elsewhere. The guilt is society's and therefore nobody's. Blame can be traced to our economic system, or to bad plumbing, or to a defective school system, or to an inadequate home situation, but never to individuals. Individuals are more to be pitied than to be blamed. They are victims of poverty, or bad companions, or of a traumatic experience at birth, or the sinister powers of the unconscious, over which they have no control. We sum it all up by saying, To know all is to forgive all. That is to say, if we really knew *all* the factors that enter into a man's life, no one would ever be blameable. A man is a tumbling tumbleweed, blown helplessly about by every wind of influence.

Whatever other failures may be his, modern theories of human behavior have been startlingly successful in undermining the sense of personal responsibility and in giving to modern man an easy conscience. Moral buck-passing is our favorite sport. In the words of Archibald MacLeish, we are refugees from consequences, exiles from the responsibilities of moral choice. And the result is just what may be expected. Listen to Martin Niemoeller as he comments upon the situation in his own country:

"Nobody," writes Niemoeller, "wants to take the responsibility of the guilt, no one of our German people is guilty, everybody shoves the guilt over to his neighbor. The local official says: 'I am only a little man, the whole guilt lies with you, Herr local commander'; and he in turn says: 'I did not wrong anybody; I only obeyed orders. The whole guilt lies with you, you of the Gestapo,' but the latter doesn't want it either and finally everything lands on Himmler and Hitler."

Let no one think that this problem is peculiar to Germany. The attitude is the prevailing one everywhere. Negatively, there is no guilt; positively there is no responsibility for improvement. Let others assume responsibility—the state, the rich, my neighbor. It is nothing to me. Pilate's hand-washing is repeated on a global scale.

But Christians know that the effort to dodge personal responsibility is illusory. Before God every man is guilty; and before God every man is responsible both for doing those things that he should not have done and for neglecting those things that he should have done. Indeed, guilt and responsibility can only be individual, ultimately. It is the man who is personally addressed by God who must personally answer for the sins done in the body. The Christian gospel is a highly individualized and individualistic thing. Committees cannot be convicted of sin; nations cannot repent. The "whosoever" of the gospel is a single person.

It is because the Christian Church understands all this that it and it alone can reawaken in the hearts

f men the sense of personal moral esponsibility. We are not the uppets of fate or the victims of ast impersonal forces beyond uman control. Man is endowed vith the creative freedom of his Maker. He is free to take a hand in etermining his own destiny, either or good or evil. And whether saint r sinner, he remains accountable.

But even this is not enough. The reedom of man is not secure until ie is free in the liberty of the sons f God. Until the conscience of man s washed and renewed in the nercies of Christ, it is not safe, aved. This is the Church's supreme rivilege in this as in every age: to oint the way to spiritual freedom, o lay the foundations of the liberty hat is found in Christ. The modern vorld is in revolt against a doc- rine of liberty that has dominated he Western mind since the Re- naissance. The revolt was not sur- rising, for the Renaissance view of reedom was false and misleading. We are now forced to rethink the rue meaning of personal freedom.

There are two kinds of freedom. The one is the freedom of up- rootedness, the freedom of a tree hat, pulled up from the confining oil, lies proudly emancipated upon he surface of the ground. It is free ll right—free to die. The other kind of freedom might be called he freedom of proper functioning. t is the freedom of the tree which, ecurely planted in the soil, lets lown its roots and lifts its leaves o the sunshine that it might grow nd express itself in the liberty of ts nature. In our confusion of erms, both trees are called free, ut their freedoms are exact op- posites. The uprooted tree is free n the freedom of death; the planted ree is free in the freedom of life.

For human beings, too, there is a freedom of uprootedness and a freedom of proper functioning. If a man mistakes the one for the other only disaster can result. The free- dom of uprootedness is the freedom of the man who, emancipated from God and the good, is at liberty to run his own life any way he wants to. This is the freedom the Western world has most prized. It is the false freedom of sin and it can only issue in death.

Emancipated or Uprooted?

For man in being emancipated from God is also emancipated from his true self. Cut off from the ele- mental energies of life, the uprooted man is fated to wander through deserts of frustration, loneliness, insecurity and meaninglessness. His freedom becomes an intoler- able burden to him of which he would gladly be rid. He becomes an easy prey to the dictator who promises him meaning and security if he will but submerge himself in the group and submit to the dis- cipline of the party. The liberty of uprootedness ends in the bondage of the totalitarian state.

But there is another freedom, the freedom of proper functioning. The man that knows this free- dom is like a tree planted by the rivers of water, which bringeth forth his fruit in his season. This is the freedom which Jesus Christ died to give, and if the Son shall make you free ye shall be free in- deed. Those who possess this free- dom are rooted deeply in the love of God and, drawing sustenance from that love, grow and fulfill themselves to the full measure of their nature. This is the freedom of life and not death; the gift of God to every man who believeth. Planted in the love of God, he finds

both the meaning and the security of life.

Here is the urgency for the preaching of the gospel. Only when the conscience of man is under the Lordship of Christ is it safe against the pressures of evil. It is a fact worth pondering that the main resistance to the totalitarian evil has come not from the universities and not from the corporations and not from the trade unions, but from the churches. Those who have been bought with a price can never be servants of men. The Niemoellers, the Berggravs, the Verniers, and all the nameless heroes that follow in their train, cannot prostrate themselves before the dictator because they have already kneeled before the Crucified. They cannot be broken by men because they have already been broken by God. These are they who, in their day and generation, exemplify the spir of Samuel Davies, the simp preacher of the gospel who rebuke a king. Seeing King George th Second of England whisper, th young man, still in his twentie paused and addressed himself the monarch in these words: "Whe the lion roars the beasts of th field keep silence, for he is kin When King Jesus speaks the kin of the earth keep silence."

Berdyaev once wrote, ". . . th time is coming, indeed it has a ready come, when freedom will h found only in Christianity, whe the Church of Christ will defen the freedom of man against th violence of the kingdom of th world." This is the calling to whic God has called us in our day. L us not falter. "There is a foe. The is a fight!" But, thank God, the is more. "There is a victory!"

Many Are Called

In the ardor and faith of our youth, we
rebelled passionately against injustice,
and all hypocrisy.
You ask, what we have done with our days,
where is that better world, where is truth
to be found in this endless, meaningless maze.
But listen, we are ill!
Each dawn we arise exhausted from contradictory
dreams of laughter, and the sight of a war torn hill.
Action, equality, the end to economic warring?
Important, and rightly so!
But not to change the subject, nor to be boring,
did you know that last week our nice young doctor
prescribed an amazing pill
For that tired feeling, and those terrible dreams
of an endless, war torn hill?

—Carol Per

Strength for These Days

Let the Redeemed Say So

By NELS F. S. FERRE

MUCH OF OUR WITNESSING is not listened to because what we say is false. Religiously the truth we speak is the truth we are. When we witness to the peace that passes all understanding and do not ourselves know it, we bear false testimony. The hearer, at his deepest level of being, listens to the experiential denial of the sentiment we express. All peace in the final analysis is personal. *Therefore let the redeemed say so.* Where God is believed, the God of all compassion, there is redemption. Our hearts are cleansed by faith. Whatever is not of faith is sin and this is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith. Where there is faith there is testimony. *Therefore let the redeemed say so.* Faith gives peace and peace gives creative power. Peace is fullness of satisfactory relationships, centered in the spiritual, which is the Real. Peace comes from living without reserve within the will of God on all levels of life. Our hearts crave this peace because we are made for it. People will listen to those who have it. *Therefore let the redeemed say so.* Such peace is creative. It abounds unto every good work even while being itself a genuine fruit of the spirit. Frustration and futility are thrust out by growth in grace. People who cannot find a hearing for themselves sometimes find it for their very work's sake. *Therefore let the redeemed say so.* Naturally the unregenerate heart can refuse to listen or to understand. Religious truth is more choosing than mere seeing. But when the redeemed speak, the sinner can have no excuse for his sin. Deep down, he knows that the truth has been spoken, far below the level of words. The Word never comes back void. In God's time and way it bears its eventual fruit. Witnessing is necessary in season and out of season. *Therefore let the redeemed say so.* Too many who have no peace within God's full will speak for peace, confusing the world. Too many seek peace apart from His will. Many even hope for peace primarily through political action. The redeemed know better. A clear voice as to the way to the only real and lasting peace is more than ever needed. *Therefore let the redeemed say so!*

Prayer

O God Invisible, Whose word is in the silence and Whose work in the unseen, deliver us from noise and agitation, and bless the time to come with heartfelt rest and fruitful labor, through Him whose yoke is easy and whose burden light.

—RECONCILIATION

News from the Peace Front

Government Publishes Report on COs in World War II

A two-volume report on COs under the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 has recently been issued. It contains information and opinions that will be of the liveliest interest to pacifists in general, and COs in particular, covering as it does all types of COs, from IAOs through CPS to prison.

Volume I reports on the operation of CPS and IAO, the 1940 law itself, court decisions, etc. Volume II is an appendix, and includes directives to CPS camps, CPS work statistics, and final reports by superintendents of mental hospitals and training schools, among other information.

The report contains much in the way of valuable statistics. For example, 6,086 men went to prison, 11,950 to CPS, and an estimated 25,000 were inducted into the armed forces with IAO. (Why the government had to "estimate" the number of IAOs is not explained.) The report estimates that perhaps as many as 75,000 registrants indicated a degree of conscientious objection. More than 52,000 were actually classified IV-E or IAO, but evidently some 15,000 were never inducted. The difference between those classified (52,000) and those who may have been COs (75,000) is largely accounted for by the fact that many COs had other deferments.

Most of the men who went to prison did not finally make the decision to do so until somewhere in the midst of the draft process, fo only 271 were nonregistrants. Th largest number, 3,721, were sent t jail for failure to report for induc tion, with 1,624 for failure to re port to CPS, 320 failing to compl in CPS, 71 refusing to report fo physicals, 51 failing to retur questionnaires, and 28 being trie for counseling or aiding evasio of the draft. 203 men were con victed twice under SS 1940, an two men three times. The figure o failure to report for inductio (3,721) probably includes mostl men who would have gone to CP if they had received IV-E classifica tion, and may indicate that mor lenient handling would have save the government a great deal o expense and trouble in sendin COs to jail. In another section th report gives it as the opinion of S officials and those who used COs o detached service that CPS was use ful and "helpful to the war effort whereas COs who went to priso were not merely a dead loss, bu a liability as far as the governmen is concerned, so one part of th draft machinery seems to hav been cutting off its nose to spit the government's face. Althoug SS officials promptly squelched proposal in Congress to discontinu civilian service entirely, the arme services pointing out that they di not want conscientious objectors i their forces, it was probably du to Selective Service that the dra act of 1948 is much more narro in its definition of a CO, and ma

herefore result in a higher proportion of COs going to prison.

In the section where church administration of CPS is discussed, he report is silent about criticisms by the churches, but gives considerable space to protests by the amps and to criticisms of the hurch administration. The item hat keeps cropping up is the failure f the churches to be stricter about isciplining men in their CPS amps; and the report reveals no nderstanding at all of why this vas a difficult problem for the hurch administrators or of the act that by its very nature this natter of discipline was the catalyst or all the problems of CPS and he point at which the churches' cruples were bound to come to he surface first.

Those interested can obtain the eport from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C., by asking for the title *Conscientious Objection, Special Monograph No. 11.* Volume I is $1.25 and Volume II is $1.00.

Brotherhood Pledge Huge Success

The Brotherhood Pledge campaign during February, sponsored by the FOR and CORE, snowballed into a big thing in its second year. By the middle of February 40,000 copies of the pledge had been sent out to individuals all over the country, many by local organizations which requested hundreds or thousands of copies, to send out to their own lists. The FOR office alone received pledges from individuals in 32 states that they would refuse to patronize places that discriminated, and would work actively for better understanding and relations. Meetings were held in a number of towns and cities on the theme of race relations, and were very well attended.

The most poignant response, contained in a note sent in with a signed pledge, said: "I follow the principles set forth in the pledge every day, and have done so since I was a child of six, a white child, watching a Negro being dragged through the streets, tied to the rear of a car . . . on his way to be tarred and feathered and burned."

Interracial Workshops Planned for Summer

The Interracial Workshops, organized and supervised by George Houser, will be held again this year in Washington and St. Louis. A major factor in breaking down segregation in restaurants and theaters in Washington, and in laying the groundwork for the amicable reopening of public swimming pools in both cities after interracial riots had closed them, the Interracial Workshops are training schools for nonviolent direct action that have the added value of being able to show definite results.

The curriculum will include study in the history of race relations and nonviolent techniques, interracial living by the groups, and participation in specific projects for bringing about good race relations and the abolition of segregation. As in past years, people who have been active in different aspects of race relations will be present at various times to contribute their insights to the group. The Workshops will last through the month of July. For information write George Houser, 21 Audubon Avenue, New York 32, N. Y.

COs Sentenced; Reserve Resignation OKd

Don Noble, of Tracy, California, was arrested for failure to register and released in $1,000 bail.

James Lawson, 21, of Massillon, Ohio, a pre-ministerial student, was indicted on March 13 in Chicago for refusal to register.

Robert Beach of Chicago, Illinois, was tried for nonregistration on April 9, and sentenced to three years in prison.

Joel, Orin, Paul and *Sidney Doty* of Bruno, Minnesota, pleaded *nolo contendere* to a charge of refusal to register. On April 6 they were sentenced in federal court in Duluth before Judge Dennis F. Donovan. Joel, the oldest, received a 2-year sentence, and the other three got sentences of 18 months each, for nonregistration.

Thomas Burgtorf, Jehovah's Witness of San Carlos, California, was sentenced to five years in November for refusal to comply with the draft, when he failed to receive ministerial exemption.

Salvador Quescade, JW of Oakland, California, was sentenced in January to three years in prison.

Alfred Dana of Carmel, California, who received a five year sentence on February 7, as reported in March FELLOWSHIP, was convicted of refusal to take the oath of induction, not for nonregistration.

Cesar Bugany of France, who is serving his fourth sentence, (bringing his total to four years and nine months), went on a 15-day hunger strike in Metz prison on January 22. He is faced with the possibility of a fifth trial.

Donald Nagler was arrested in Indiana for refusal to report fo induction.

Howard Douglas of New Jerse was arrested for refusal to registe

Jim George was arrested in Ne York City for refusal to carry draft card, and released on bail.

Kenneth Champney of Yello Springs, Ohio, was arrested for re fusal to report for induction.

Robert Michener, who receive a sentence of ten years on Febru ary 23 in Kansas, was the subject an editorial and a long news sto in the Washington *Daily News* c March 6. The news story reviewe his Quaker background and h draft history, while the editori criticized the renewed prosecutio and the harshness of the sentenc

An Army Captain recently ha his resignation from the reserv accepted because he had become conscientious objector, and som other reservists who have asked resign have received requests fo further information, indicating tha the Army may soon recogniz sincere conscientious objection grounds for resignation from th Reserves. The Navy and Air Forc have both released some CO re servists already on these ground Reservists who feel they can n longer participate in the arme forces are urged by the NSBRO t tender their resignation immedi ately. These should go to Presider Truman or the Adjutant Genera and to the commanding officer their reserve headquarters. Th letter should state fully the reaso for the resignation and, if possibl some objective cause for the chang of opinion, such as joining church. Accompanying letters fro persons who can vouch for th objector's sincerity may also b helpful.

Problems of Noncombatant COs in the Armed Forces

In response to inquiries inspired by reports that IAOs might find their noncombatant position was not being respected once they are in the armed forces, the National Service Board sets forth the procedure a CO should follow in such a case. He should write a letter, supplemented with personal contact, to his chaplain and his commander, with a statement of his complaints and a description of the ways in which his rights are being violated according to the regulations. Probably he will be given a deposition, or a period of questions and answers. If he can get no satisfaction he should write to the Chief of Chaplains of his branch of the service and to the Secretary of that branch in Washington, and to one of the pacifist or CO organizations in this country, which may be able to help by seeing officials in Washington.

Students Organize to Spread Peace

At Manchester College in Indiana, about eighty students met on February 18 to discuss college pacifist concerns. They came from Manchester, Earlham, Goshen, Oberlin and Ball State Teachers' College to discuss their own problems and general problems relating to peace and pacifism.

They reported various activities that have been carried on in the colleges, including sending teams to speak about pacifism on other campuses and in churches, spreading pacifist information through school newspapers and radio programs, placing pacifist literature in college libraries, sponsoring pacifist chapel speakers, organizing campus discussion groups, and supporting various types of voluntary service projects.

They discussed the draft and alternative service as well, obviously the point at which the world situation comes home to young people even if they have not already gone out to meet it. At the close of the meeting the group appointed a committee to keep groups at the various colleges in touch with each others' plans, and to make arrangements for possible future meetings.

AFSC Projects for This Coming Summer

The New England Region of the AFSC has two important projects planned for this summer. On July 6-13 there will be a Workshop-Retreat at Friendly Crossways, a farm at Harvard, Massachusetts, and on August 25-31 a Pacifist Family Institute will be held at Camp Timberlake, in Plymouth, Vermont. Both are of great interest to FOR members, who may get more information by writing to Russell Johnson, AFSC, 1374 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts.

Muriel Lester left England by air in October, 1950, for Pakistan and India, Burma and Thailand. She applied for permission to visit Japan (her third visit) and then crossed the Pacific via the Philippines and Honolulu, landing in California in February. From the middle of February until May she traveled throughout the United States.

Peace Personalities Abroad

IFOR to Hold Youth Conference

The International FOR will sponsor a youth conference to be held at Elsinore, Denmark, from August 4-11 this summer. The program is being planned by an international youth committee set up last summer, and the general subject will be "Christian Youth and the Problems of Peace." Any young people who expect to be in Europe around that time will find it an interesting and valuable experience. Attendance is not limited entirely to FOR members. Cost of accommodations at the conference will be less than $2 a day. Applications and requests for further information should go to Percy Bartlett, 38 Gordon Square, London W. C. 1, England.

British Organizations Appeal for China Peace

The National Peace Council, which for forty years has coordinated some fifty British organizations working for world peace, recently set up an emergency Inter-Party Peace with China Council. This council, which has no connection with the Communist peace campaign, points out that emergency overflows had to be arranged for two large public meetings devoted to the subject of peace with China in order to accommodate the two to three thousand people who attended. The Council has been swamped by hundreds of letters from people all over the country, a number of whom are officials of Labor, Conservative and Liberal Associations, who are eager to foster an honorable, just and peaceful settlement with China.

Attacks Russian Evangelical Religion

The preaching of "love for all people" is at present "not philanthropy but misanthropy," according to Soviet writer V. O. Sokolov, writing in the last issue for 1950 of the Soviet paper *Science and Life.*

Mr. Sokolov said, in part: "The preaching of 'love for all people' under conditions of the acute struggle between the old rotting world of capitalism and the new growing world of communism, of the feverish preparations by Anglo-American imperialists for a new war, is in essence nothing other than lulling the vigilance of Soviet people. Under these conditions the preaching of 'love for all people' no matter what good intentions the sectarian preachers embellish it with, is a gospel not of philanthropy, but of misanthropy. Real philanthropy specifically includes sincere hatred for the enemies of laboring humanity."

SAFE Has Wrong-Way Parcels

Safe, Inc., announces a new service that will bring direct to those interested, useful, attractive and ingenious products of European craftsmanship and manufacture at reasonable prices. Write SAFE Inc., 40 Exchange Place, New York for SAFE Imports catalog.

Still No Grain Sent to India

As of this writing—April 11, 1951—the bill to send two million tons of grain to India to avert the starvation of millions of people was still petulantly bottled up by the Rules Committee of the House. Some members of Congress have made it clear that India's refusal to back this country's campaign to brand China an aggressor in the United Nations is responsible. The grain was requested by the Government of India on December 16, 1950. Although the bill has been favorably reported out by other committees, the Rules Committee can prevent legislation by simply failing to report it out to the floor, and this committee has irresponsibly exercised this type of censorship in the past. Write your Senators and Congressmen, urging them to do everything possible to see that the bill is reported out at once.

Young People Would Work for Peace

In a course of Christmas holiday lectures arranged by the Council of Education in World Citizenship in London, problems vital to the future peace of the world were tackled for three thousand school children. One thousand of them said that they would be willing to train and go into backward countries as workers for UNESCO. It was pointed out by speakers that the first lesson was to learn what is good in a culture and build on it. Efforts must be aimed at progress with and by the people, not for the people. The approach must be one of humility and sympathy, desire to help people help themselves, and one of equal working with equal, partner with partner.

After three days of meetings, the Council invited the (Communist) Workers' Choir to sing at a concert which included English folk airs, songs by Purcell and one or two tunes from behind the Iron Curtain. The song of the Bulgarian Youth League and a song from New China—both simple and much like folk tunes—were sung and well received.

The boldness of the Council in inviting Communists to cooperate in the program was in keeping with allowing all people a free hearing. Equally free later in the conference was an attack on Sovietism. There was an awareness, however, on the whole, that only through international cooperation can peace come.

Help Build

HOUSES FOR HIROSHIMA

Last year a small group of Japanese and American students, with employed help, built new homes in Hiroshima and Nagasaki for thirteen families who had lost their homes by the Atom Bomb. This was their way of saying, "We believe there is a better way." The money for these homes came from people in many countries who also seek this "better way." This year we will build more homes for the *six thousand families* still homeless in these two cities. Will you share with us in this mission of active good will?

FLOYD SCHMOE, DIRECTOR

Make checks payable to *Houses for Hiroshima* and mail to Florence Hornig, Eastern Representative, 513 West 166th Street, New York 32, N. Y., or Friends Center, 3959 15th N. E., Seattle 5, Washington.

Letters

Student Pacifists

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

There are many students the world over who believe in the principles and purpose of your fellowship, but they are just not informed about the FOR. Even though I graduated from a university in America I had not heard of the Fellowship of Reconciliation till I met a group of young people who were planning to spend three years teaching and leading the Japanese youth. I have been studying and trying to think through my beliefs and ideas about pacifism, and since December of last year have been an active member of a peace study group here in Osaka. In January we were very privileged to hear and visit with Miss Muriel Lester and this month we will have a special meeting with Dr. Stanley Jones.

For some time I have believed in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, but have never become a member or offered any financial help. I would like to apply for membership now.

To help extend this Fellowship I am having a portion of my salary sent each month while I am still with the Board of Foreign Missions.

When Miss Lester came, we called a special meeting of those people who were pacifists or interested in studying pacifism. We started another study group at the YMCA. Everywhere students seem very interested in any and all suggestions for peace other than rearmament. Last weekend I visited with the students in Kanazawa and they asked about the Fellowship of Reconciliation. One of the teachers and leaders of youth work there had been a pacifist all during the wa They are hoping to start a group the in Kanazawa (west coast of Japan).

There are two students who want start a group in Kyoto, and a group Christians are meeting in Kobe to he about the FOR and I am going to brin some peace pamphlets to them so th they may study the real purpose pacifism.

JANE FISCHE
Osaka, Japa

The Catholic Position

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

The book *Separate Church and Sta Now*, by Joseph M. Dawson, reviewed i the December issue of FELLOWSHIP, pr sents a serious problem for Fellowshi members. Is an injustice being done the Catholic Church or should lovers peace and religious freedom side wit Mr. Dawson? As one who was raise Baptist, who has long been interested i the Fellowship of Reconciliation and wh was recently baptised Catholic, I fe fairly well qualified to present the Cath olic side. I shall merely present tw quotations and urge you to make thorough study of Catholic writings f yourself.

The first is from Pope Pius XI "There are some, and they are we known, who accuse Us quite unjustly wanting war, and of collaborating this end with 'imperialist' powers, wh they say, place their hopes rather in th power of destructive weapons of wa than in the practice of injustice. Wha

LOVE THE LAW OF LIFE

By TOYOHIKO KAGAWA

This classic gem on love has been recently revised through the efforts of Glenn Clark so that English speaking readers could have a really good translation of this inspiring masterpiece by the world-renowned Japanese Christian. If you heard Dr. Kagawa when he toured the U.S. and Canada in 1950, you'll want to catch again some of the inspiration of his ideas of love and service. If you did not hear him, this is your opportunity to get acquainted with the spiritual heights and depths of Kagawa's thinking. Foreword by Allan Hunter. Afterword by Glenn Clark. 96 pages, $1.25

MACALESTER PARK PUBLISHING COMPANY
1571 Grand Avenue, St. Paul 5, Minnesota

ɔW COST 30-60 DAY TRIPS ABROAD FOR FELLOWSHIP PEOPLE

CHRISTIAN YOUTH CARAVAN. (Europe; primarily ages 18-35) 62 days, . N. Y. June 17. Visit 7 countries, observing religious, political, social, economic ɐne in interviews with outstanding persons, field trips, visits in homes and schools, ɕeting FOR-WRI leaders of each country. One week each at Pastor Mensching's ɐundschaftsheim peace work camp, at André Trocmé's IFOR Center near Paris ɾring UNESCO Assembly, at International School of European Affairs (Zurich), ɪternational People's College (Danish folk school) etc. Also many "sights" including akespeare play, Oslofjord trip Norway, overnight on Jungfrau Mtn. Limited En- ment. All-exp. incl. flight, $860.

COOPERATIVE DEMOCRACY. Similar to No. 1 but emphasizes co-ops. Co- ɔnsored by 7 national co-op leagues. Cost $860.

MONTH-IN-FRANCE. 30 days incl. airtrip. Lv. N. Y. June 23. Three weeks IFOR ɪter Versailles. Program: UNESCO, French culture, affairs, and peace movements. ɪe week Strasbourg (Council of Europe). All-exp. $660.

ꓕHER TOURS. Europe, Mexico, Holy Land, S. A., Round-World-Flight. Nonprofit ꓥice directed by FOR member.

Apply W. M. HAMMOND, HORIZONS UNLIMITED, Inc.
6545 S. Union, Chicago 21, Illinois

else can We answer to this bitter calumny except: Sift the troubled twelve years of Our Pontificate; weigh every word that Our lips have uttered, every sentence Our pen has written; you will find in them only appeals for peace."

The second is from the 44th Article of the Irish Constitution: "The State recognizes the special position of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church as the guardian of the Faith professed by the great majority of the citizens. The State also recognizes the Church of Ireland, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the Methodist Church in Ireland, the Religious Society of Friends in Ireland, as well as the Jewish Congregations and other religious denominations, existing in Ireland at the date of coming into operation of this Constitution. Freedom of conscience and the free profession and practice of religion are, subject to public order and morality, guaranteed to every citizen."

JOSEPHINE KRUGER
Saugerties, New York

GLIXON

(*Continued from page 6*)

The matter of war and peace is still in the balance. It is only realistic to be a pessimist about the probabilities. Nothing short of a moral revolution—among ourselves—can avert a war, and such a revolution would certainly imply a series of social and political revolutions of comparable force. But the event is still up to us, a matter of human choice. Given a change of heart, a realist will also be an optimist about the *possibilities.*

ADVERTISEMENTS

"The Need: Unconditional Surrender World Government—United States—Rus sia," two-tone color printed on bl lined business envelopes ½c each c livered. Stamps accepted. ALEC BEASLEY, R. R. 1, KELOWNA, B.C. CANADA.

BOOKS UNLIMITED is the place to bu your books. Specializing for years nationwide mail-order service for peo like you.

BOOKS UNLIMITED is a true coope tive. Membership costs one dollar. Y order *any* book you need (we repe *any book in print*). We pay postage. also supply records and place magaz subscriptions.

BOOKS UNLIMITED gets books often seen in bookstores, and best selli too. Join now; order now; or write leaflets.

BOOKS UNLIMITED, Box 775, Berkel California. Stan Gould, manager.

Mathematics M.A., pacifist, wife, ch seeks small college or high school po preferably in Midwest. Qualified physs chemistry, German. Experience one y high, three years college, four ye CPS, 1½ year with AFSC in Euro Would consider other suitable work. B 247, Dahlonega, Georgia.

For summer, why not come to Ridi Lights in North Truro, overlook Cape Code Bay? *The Tides* (Low T High Tide and Half Tide) a studio c tage, 2½ rooms, everything for li housekeeping; *Quarters Aft,* two-roo apartment, furnished for light hou keeping; *The Focsle,* large 2½ roo apartment, furnished for light hou keeping. All include hot water day night, electricity, gas heaters if neec local use of phone, and parking spa Rates: July or August, $150 each; s son June 15 through Labor Day, $ One-third deposit with reservati balance on arrival. Out of season (M October) $25 week, $4 day. Year-rou rates on request—ample heat. Write Mrs. C. W. Smith, North Truro, Mas chusetts.

FOR Field Secretaries

Midwest: Albert Watson, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Far West:* Orval Etter, 1941 Oregon Street, Berkeley 3, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, Room 115, 213 S. Broadway, Los Angeles 12, Cal.; *Middle Atlantic:* Charles Walker, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

Why Pay More?

Always on the alert for book bargains to pass along to its customers, the FOR Literature Department recently ran across (or was run across by) a choice opportunity, of which it promptly took advantage.

Above All Nations

By Catlin, Brittain, Hodges, Spindler and Allen

Was $2.00 **Now 35¢**

The publisher is remaindering the book now, and we have bought the last 1322 copies, and are able to sell them at a spectacularly reduced price. If you've never read this, now's your chance. If you have, you'll want to buy ten or twenty copies to give away to friends, ministers, and libraries.

While we're at it---

There's another bargain you'll want to be reminded of. We've sold 500 copies in the past year, and have just bought 1002 more.

The LAW of LOVE and the LAW of VIOLENCE

By Leo Tolstoy

Was $3.00 **Now $1.00**

Also---

Defeat Triumphant **Was $2.00—— Now $1.00**
By British FOR Secretary Lewis Maclachlan

Peace Is Possible **Was $2.00—— Now 50c**
Symposium by Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

1 Audubon Avenue New York 32, N. Y.

"A stirring statement of faith. . . ."

The DAGGER and the CROSS

By CULBERT G. RUTENBER

"A stirring statement of faith for the future and for the action of man. I should like to see every professing Christian read this book prayerfully and thoughtfully. . . ."

The American Friend

"Most important book. . . ."

The DAGGER and the CROSS

By CULBERT G. RUTENBER

"This is the most important book to appear in this field since the second World War . . . brilliantly written . . . its viewpoint is that of pacifism baptized into Neo-Orthodoxy, but nevertheless pacifism. . . ."

San Francisco Seminary *Chimes*

"Concise and readable. . . ."

The DAGGER and the CROSS

By CULBERT G. RUTENBER

"Dr. Rutenber treats the major dilemmas in which the Christian finds himself in relation to war and the state . . . concise and readable."

Chicago Theological Seminary *Register*

"Fair, objective and constructive. . . ."

The DAGGER and the CROSS

By CULBERT G. RUTENBER

"This little book presents a fair, objective and constructive analysis of the dilemma in which every sincere Christian finds himself when faced with the inescapable contradiction between the practice of war and the Christian ideal."

The Christian Advocate

Only **$1.00** a copy

FELLOWSHIP PUBLICATIONS

21 Audubon Avenue New York 32, N. Y.